

The long wavelength limit of hard thermal loop effective actions

F. T. Brandt¹, J. Frenkel¹ and J. C. Taylor²

¹ Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo,
Rua do Matão, Travessa R, 187, São Paulo, SP 05508-090, Brazil

² DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, United Kingdom

January 22, 2009

Abstract

We derive a closed form expression for the long wavelength limit of the effective action for hard thermal loops in an external gravitational field. It is a function of the metric, independent of time derivatives. It is compared and contrasted with the static limit, and with the corresponding limits in an external Yang-Mills field.

1 Introduction

In perturbative thermal field theory, in order to partly control infra-red divergences, it is necessary first to calculate hard thermal loops, where external momenta are much less than the temperature T [1, 2]. The effective actions for the hard thermal loops enjoy some nice properties [3]. They are non-local, gauge-invariant (not just BRST invariant) functionals of external Yang-Mills or gravitational fields.

There are two special cases: the static limit (where the external fields are time-independent) and long wave-length (LWL) limit (where the external fields are position independent). In both these limits, the effective actions turn out to be functions (not functionals) of the external fields, with no derivatives at all. That is, in momentum space, the static limit is independent of momenta as well as energies, and the LWL limit is independent

of energies as well as momenta. Nevertheless, these two limits give different functions.

2 External Yang Mills field

For hard thermal loops in an external Yang Mills field, both the static and the LWL limits turn out to be non-zero for the 2-point function only. This may be written, in general, in the form [4]

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}_{\text{YM}} g^2 T^2}{12\pi} \int d\Omega \left[k_0 \frac{Q_\mu Q_\nu}{k \cdot Q} - n_\mu n_\nu \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\text{YM}}$ is a Casimir for the internal particles, g is the coupling-constant, k is the external field momentum, $n = (1; 0, 0, 0)$, $Q = (1; \mathbf{Q})$ with $|\mathbf{Q}| = 1$, and the integration is over its directions.

The static limit ($k_0 = 0$) is obtained immediately from (1). It comes from the second term alone, and is clearly independent of $\mathbf{k}$. It is easy to verify that this result is invariant under gauge transformations independent of time.

In the LWL limit, $k_0/k \cdot Q = 1$, and the angular integration is trivial and the two terms in (1) cancel unless both μ and ν are space-like. The contribution is then independent of k_0 , and differs by a factor $-1/3$ from the static limit. It is again easy to check that the result is gauge invariant under gauge transformations independent of position. This suggests that it is the complete effective action in the LWL limit.

One can in fact show that all higher point functions are zero in either the static or LWL limits. For the static case, this follows from equation (8) of reference [5].

For the LWL limit, we can proceed as follows. Take first the 3-point function. The Ward identities (which are known to apply to hard thermal amplitudes [2]) state

$$k_0 \Gamma_{0,\mu,\nu}(k, p, q) = g \Gamma_{\mu,\nu}(p) - g \Gamma_{\mu,\nu}(q) \quad (2)$$

Since the two terms on the right are independent of momenta in the LWL limit, all components of the 3-point function vanish except perhaps the purely spatial indices. Further, the function involves angular integral like (see for example [2]) (here a, b, c are colour indices)

$$\int d\Omega F^{abc}(k, p, q, k \cdot Q, p \cdot Q, q \cdot Q) Q_\lambda Q_\mu Q_\nu \quad (3)$$

In the LWL limit, the function F is independent of $\mathbf{Q}$ and therefore of Q . So the 0, 0, 0 component (for example) of the above tensor is non-zero unless the function $F = 0$ itself. It follows that all components of the 3-point function vanish in the LWL limit.

Actually, the part of the 3-point function with all indices spatial must vanish in the LWL limit anyway, by rotational invariance. However, we give the argument in the above form because it generalizes in an obvious way to the 4-point function and higher.

Up to the 4-point function, the LWL limit can also be found explicitly from the expressions given in reference [2].

3 External gravitational field

For hard thermal loops in an external gravitational field, the static limit is well known [6] and can be written in terms of an effective action as

$$S_S = \frac{\mathcal{C} \pi^2 T^4}{90} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} (g_{00})^{-2}, \quad (4)$$

where the Casimir $\mathcal{C}$ gives the number of internal degrees of freedom (for internal bosons; for internal fermions there is an extra factor of 1/2) and the time integration is taken over a finite range, since the integrand is time-independent. This is invariant under time-independent gauge transformations, and under Weyl transformations.

We have not been able to find a similar explicit closed form for the LWL limit. But there is an implicit closed form representation, inspired by a Boltzmann equation approach [7]. We will first state this form, verify that it is invariant under gauge (that is coordinate transformations) and Weyl transformations, and finally prove that it is the unique, correct result.

The form of the effective action in this limit is

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{LWL}} &= \frac{\mathcal{C}}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^4x \int d^4p \theta(p_0) [\theta(g^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu) - \theta(\eta^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu)] N(\sqrt{p_i p_i}/T) \\ &= -\frac{\mathcal{C} \pi T^4}{120} \int d^4x \int d\Omega \left[\sqrt{\left(\frac{Q_i g^{0i}}{g^{00}} \right)^2 - \frac{g^{ij} Q_i Q_j}{g^{00}}} - 1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where N is the Bose distribution function (if the internal particles are fermions, an extra factor 1/2 should be inserted in the second line of (5)) and the space integral is taken to be over a finite volume, since the integrand is space-independent. This form is suggested because p_i is a solution of the

Boltzmann equation ((3) of [7]) in the LWL limit. Also, p_i is invariant under space-independent gauge transformations. The above function has three properties. It is gauge invariant under gauge transformations independent of position and it is Weyl invariant. Furthermore, if we expand in powers of h where

$$\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} + h^{\mu\nu} \quad (6)$$

the coefficients of

$$h^{\mu\nu}h^{\lambda\sigma}\dots$$

are totally symmetric in $\mu, \nu, \lambda, \sigma, \dots$. We will now show, from the analysis of the hard thermal perturbation theory, that these three properties are required, and that they suffice to determine the HTL uniquely. It thus follows that (5) is correct.

We shall take as an example the 3-graviton term in perturbation theory, but try to express the argument so it is clear how it generalizes to higher orders. According to [8], the 3-graviton amplitude involves a angular integration (as in (5)) of a tensor

$$C_{\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma}(Q, k, k', k''). \quad (7)$$

The tensor could be proportional to some product of the vectors $Q_\mu, k_\mu, k'_\mu, k''_\mu$ and the Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$.

The tensor C in (7) obeys a Ward identity connecting it to the 2-graviton tensor:

$$2k^\mu C_{\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma}(Q, k, k', k'') = [-k_\alpha C_{\lambda\beta,\rho\sigma}(Q, k'') - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta) + k'_\lambda C_{\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma}(Q, k'')] + [k', \alpha, \beta \leftrightarrow k'', \rho, \sigma] \quad (8)$$

and also a Weyl identity

$$\eta^{\rho\sigma} C_{\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma}(Q, k, k', k'') = -C_{\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta}(Q, k) - C_{\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta}(Q, k') \quad (9)$$

These identities are in fact sufficient to determine C in (7). But for the moment we deduce only that the tensor C in (7) does not have any terms containing $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. The reason is, firstly, that the 2-graviton term on the right of the Ward identity (8) do not contain $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ etc., and secondly that there is no k_λ on the right of (8) as there would be if (7) contained $\eta_{\mu\lambda}$. This argument can be continued iteratively to all orders.

We now specialize to the LWL limit. Then the tensor C in (7) must be proportional to some product of the vectors Q and n (and not the tensor η). Also, the Ward identity (8) becomes

$$2C_{0\lambda,\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma} = -[n_\alpha C_{\lambda\beta,\rho\sigma} + (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta) + \frac{1}{2}n_\lambda C_{\alpha\beta,\rho\sigma}] - (\alpha, \beta \leftrightarrow \rho, \sigma) \quad (10)$$

Thus all components of the 3-point function are determined, and are independent of energies, except the one with purely spatial indices.

Next, Weyl invariance (9) determines the trace $C_{\sigma\mu\lambda,\alpha\beta}^\sigma$, and therefore the spatial trace $C_{ii,kl,mn}$ is also determined. But, $C_{ij,kl,mn}$ is proportional to $Q_i Q_j Q_k Q_l Q_m Q_n$ and so it is totally symmetric; so if its trace is determined the complete tensor is determined.

These arguments can be generalized to all orders. We infer that the LWL limit is uniquely determined by three conditions: the Ward identity (8), the Weyl identity (9), and the complete symmetry of the purely spatial parts of the C tensors (which is a consequence of the absence of the η tensor). The conjectured form (5) satisfies all these three conditions, so it must be the correct unique LWL limit. (It must satisfy the Ward identities (9) because the first line of (5) is explicitly gauge invariant.) In fact, up to the 4-point function, we have explicitly verified that (5) consistently generates, in the LWL limit, the perturbative hard thermal loops in a gravitational field.

Acknowledgments

F. T. B. and J. F. would like to thank FAPESP and CNPq (Brasil) for a grant.

References

- [1] E. Braaten, R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. B337 (1990) 569; B339 (1990) 310; Phys. Rev. D45 (1992) 1827.
- [2] J. Frenkel, J. C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B334 (1990) 199; B374 (1992) 156.
- [3] F. T. Brandt, J. Frenkel, J. C. Taylor, S. M. H. Wong, Can. J. Phys. 71 (1993) 219.
- [4] M. L. Bellac, Thermal Field Theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1996.
- [5] J. C. Taylor, S. M. H. Wong, Nucl. Phys. B346 (1990) 115.

- [6] A. Rebhan, Nucl. Phys. B351 (1991) 706; J. Frenkel, J. C. Taylor, Z. Phys. C49 (1991) 515.
- [7] F. T. Brandt, J. Frenkel, J. C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B437 (1995) 433.
- [8] F. T. Brandt, J. Frenkel, J. C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B374 (1992) 169.